## TABULATION SHEET

Request for Proposal 15-0206, Construction Manager Services, Court House Renovation with Option for Public Defender Building

Opening Date and Time: 19 Nov 14, 3:00 PM

Contracting Officer: B. Schwartzman

| VENDOR                       | LOCATION | Pre-con Fee<br>(Lump Sum) | Initial CM Fee<br>(% of GMP) | Revised CM Fee (% of GMP) |
|------------------------------|----------|---------------------------|------------------------------|---------------------------|
| Johnson-Laux Construction    | Orlando  | \$0.00                    | 4%                           | 7 – 8%                    |
| SEMCO Construction, Inc.     | Bartow   | \$5,000.00                | 6.5%                         | 8.5 – 9%                  |
| Emmett Sapp Builders         | Wildwood | \$7,000.00                | 9%                           | No change                 |
| Evergreen Construction Mgmt. | Leesburg | \$15,000.00               | 10%                          | No change                 |
| McCree Design Builders       | Orlando  | \$44,987.00               | 6.5%                         | 16%                       |
| Schmid Construction          | Clermont | \$70,000.00               | 12.5%                        | Lesser fee possible       |

## Notes:

- 1. The initial tabulation sheet under the subject RFP is hereby updated to reflect final pricing.
- 2. The revision in Construction Management fees reflected in the final column of the table above resulted from discussions with all vendors during the interview cycle of the evaluation process. The values that were adjusted upward reflect non-inclusion of RFP-specified costs in the various vendors' initially proposed management fee. The potential lower fee value for Schmid is based on deletion of certain cost elements beyond those specified in the RFP that were initially included in the fee value, and consideration of general competitive factors.
- 3. At deliberations after completion of interviews, the Selection Committee unanimously agreed that Schmid Construction appeared to be the best qualified and capable firm for the project based on that firm's detailed and realistic project plans and performance history. The Committee then unanimously recommended award to that vendor if their fee could be negotiated to a value reflective of the realistic competitive range (ie; at or below 10%). During subsequent negotiations, Schmid offered a 9.75% fee based on factors expressed during the course of their interview.